DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 389 176 FL 023 357

AUTHOR Torres-Guzman, Maria E.; Goodwin, Lin A.
TITLE Mentoring Bilingual Teachers. FOCUS: Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education No. 12.
INSTITUTION National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education, Washington, DC.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 95
CONTRACT T292008001
NOTE 20p.
AVAILABLE FROM NCBE, 1118 22nd Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20037.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Bilingual Education; *Bilingual Teachers; Cognitive Development; Elementary Secondary Education; English (Second Language); Higher Education; Interprofessional Relationship; Language of Instruction; *Mentors; *Preservice Teacher Education; Professional Development; *Student Teacher Supervisors; Teacher Student Relationship; Teacher Supervision

ABSTRACT

This report offers guidance to those involved in bilingual education who may be or may want to mentor novice teachers in the field. The concept of mentoring is defined, and issues of mentoring implementation and alternatives in bilingual education are discussed, such as language of instruction, culture and instruction, language and cognitive development, and transformation and power relationships. More importantly, there is a discussion on the importance of preparing teachers who will help language minority students become partners in shaping the future and who will help create partnerships with non-bilingual teachers to support this process. Implications for the national education reform movement, such as Goals 2000, are also reviewed. (Contains 51 references.) (NAV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

FOCUS

ED 389 176

Mentoring Bilingual Teachers

Occasional Papers in Bilingual Education

12

Maria E. Torres-Guzmán
Lin A. Goodwin

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FL023357

Fall
1995

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education (NCBE) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (OBEMLA) and is operated under Contract No. T292008001 by The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development, Center for Policy Studies. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of Education, nor does the mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. government. Readers are free to duplicate and use these materials in keeping with accepted publication standards. NCBE requests that proper credit be given in the event of reproduction.

Director: Joel Gómez

Series Editor: Minerva Gorena

The George Washington University
WASHINGTON DC

Mentoring Bilingual Teachers

María E. Torres-Guzmán

Lin A. Goodwin

Teachers College
Columbia University

Fall1995

INTRODUCTION

Mentoring novice teachers is an important strategy for training bilingual/bicultural education teachers because it has proven useful in curtailing the number of teachers who leave the teaching profession during the induction period of their careers. The support a beginning teacher gets from an experienced teacher helps her/him feel confident and competent. Teachers prepared to work with the language minority population, who feel confident and competent to do so, are the most scarce among all teacher groups. National data highlight the difficulties in filling bilingual/bicultural education and English-as-a-second language (ESL) teaching positions in all settings—urban, suburban, and rural. Yet, language minorities, Latinos and Asian Americans in particular, are the fastest growing student population in urban schools.

According to the Council of the Great City Schools (1992), the subset of the population that possesses limited English proficiency skills is almost three times higher in urban schools (36.1 percent) than in the nation as a whole (13.5 percent). Within the urban schools context there is great pressure on the limited number of bilingual/bicultural and ESL teachers to adequately serve the large and growing numbers of students who need their special expertise. Additionally, the constant cloud of suspicions about bilingual education raised by national debates about language and ethnicity pose additional quality demands on these teachers. While teacher education program efforts to prepare teachers who understand and can knowledgeably work with language minorities are improving, they are far from meeting the need for an increasing number of teachers. Thus, there is a need for immediate solutions such as the mentoring process.

In an era of change, where even more demands are placed on teachers to collaborate, lead, make decisions, and so on, teachers need to be supported in their work (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; The Holmes Group, 1986; Darling-Hammond and Goodwin, 1993). Mentoring programs allow for the placement of experienced teachers in leadership roles where they can help policy makers, communities, and administrators rethink what schools and education should look like and assist new teachers as they enter the profession. Through such programs, both veteran and novice teachers play a role in the process of changing schools to better prepare students for the future.

The following sections include a definition of mentoring, a review of the literature on mentoring and bilingual/bicultural education, and the identification of salient issues regarding mentoring implementation and alternatives. Last, there is a discussion of the importance of preparing teachers who will (a) help language minority students become partners in shaping the future, and (b) create partnerships with non-bilingual teachers to support this process.

WHAT IS MENTORING?

Mentoring is usually an intense, dyadic relationship in which the mentor furthers the professional and personal development of the protégé by providing information, assistance, support and guidance. Levinson et al., (1978) define a mentor as "a teacher, sponsor, counselor, developer of skills and intellect, host, guide, and exemplar" (Merriam, 1983, p. 162). This characterization of mentor as a teacher or guide who befriends, supports, and sponsors a protégé is repeated frequently in the literature (Anderson and Shannon, 1988; Daloz, 1983; Fagan and Walter, 1982; Galvez–Hjornevik, 1986; Gray and Gray, 1985; Klopf and Harrison, 1981; Odell, 1990; Zey, 1984).

In education circles, designations such as master teacher, peer teacher, support teacher, helping teacher, or teacher consultant are commonly used (Zimpher and Rieger, 1988). Levinson et al., (1978) add to the definition of mentor a critical and unique function: "to support and facilitate the realization of the Dream" (p. 98), thereby enabling the one being mentored, the protégé, to achieve his/her vision. This unique function separates historical and authentic definitions of mentoring from what teachers may spontaneously offer peers in the way of collegial support or assistance (Huling-Austin, 1990). Levels of intimacy and longevity of engagement can shape mentor/mentee relationships. Thus, a continuum of relationships from teacher/student, master/apprentice, sponsor/token, or mentor/protégé is possible (Hunt and Michael, 1983). Phillips-Jones (1982) has further categorized mentors into six types: traditional mentors, supportive bosses, organizational sponsors, professional mentors, patrons, and invisible godparents. Much depends on the type of assistance the mentor provides: giving information, offering political guidance, providing challenging assignments, counseling, assisting with career moves, developing trust, showcasing the protégé's accomplishments, protecting, and developing a personal friendship (Alleman, 1986, cited in Anderson and Shannon, 1988). These are summarized in the five types of activities that Anderson and Shannon call "conjunctive" functions—teaching, sponsoring, encouraging, counseling, and befriending. In each case, mentors engage in a range of clearly defined behaviors which seem to have the same purpose—furthering the personal and professional welfare of the protégé. Daloz (1983) characterizes this as a journey where the mentor provides direction, offers support, and presents challenges to the mentee.

Much of the mentoring literature is based on an understanding of the teaching career as developmental and as a process of maturation. Dalton, Thompson and Price (1977, cited in Hunt and Michael, 1983), see mentoring as a four-stage process through which careers may progress: apprentice, colleague, mentor, sponsor. An assumption is made that protégés will eventually mature into mentors; that is, mentoring can be characterized as part of a cyclical process.

HOW HAS MENTORING BEEN IMPLEMENTED IN BILINGUAL EDUCATION?

The literature on mentoring and bilingual teachers is not extensive; however, evidence exists that bilingual education teacher mentoring is occurring. The Multi-district Trainer of Trainers Institute (MTTI), implemented nationwide (and internationally) since 1980 (Calderon and Marsh, 1988), offers high quality staff development, continued feedback and support at the school site, and provides teachers with specific training

(such as peer coaching and observation) in order to heighten their success with innovations. Although the MTTI does not offer the typical mentor-mentee dyad strategy, it does involve teachers working as peer coaches. This model is notable because of its successful adaptation to fit bilingual education training contexts. For example, teachers receive staff development in the following areas:

> effective teaching strategies for first and second language development;
> reading and writing in two languages;
> teaching content areas through sheltered English;
> models for teaching critical thinking; and
> cooperative learning models...[which]...are sequenced according to LEP students' level of English proficiency.
> (Calderon and Marsh, 1988, p. 139)

Additionally, evaluation data on the effectiveness of this effort reveal that teachers' morale improved as did their level of instruction for LEP students.

The New York City Mentor Teacher Internship Program is another example of an ongoing program. Teachers who are not state certified and have less than one and one-half years of teaching experience are selected as mentees. They are required to complete courses toward certification and are assigned an experienced teacher to assist them. Because urban contexts often suffer bilingual teacher shortages, non-bilingual mentors must serve as bilingual resource brokers and identifiers for novice bilingual teachers. This has occurred in New York City, where, as a result of the limited number of licensed bilingual teachers, non-bilingual educators are being matched with new bilingual teachers. Non-bilingual mentors have provided bilingual expertise by helping their mentees make connections with other bilingual teachers in their respective buildings or systems. Although the bilingual teachers may not be serving officially as mentors, they are, nevertheless, critical sources of expertise and support. In addition, the mentors help novice bilingual teachers locate appropriate bilingual teacher preparation courses.

A final example is the San Marcos Independent School District in Texas, where a bilingual education model for peer coaching was developed and designed to deliver practical staff development opportunities to bilingual education teachers. The design for this particular model included a six-part workshop series on peer coaching. During the 1990-91 school year, 40 bilingual teachers worked in peer coaching pairs that engaged in peer coaching cycles involving observation, feedback, coaching, and planning. Bilingual education consultants and instructional aides provided class coverage to enable the coaching pairs to work together. At the end of the year participants reported that they felt less isolated, found mutual support, and were able to learn new instructional strategies.

Informal accounts of mentoring relationships also exist. In a study done of four pioneering bilingual teachers (each with 14 or more years of experience), Lemberger (1990) found that bilingual district coordinators played the role of mentor in bilingual education settings. Within such settings, the bilingual district coordinator is often a teacher leader, generally on a teacher track, with some administrative, but no supervisory responsibilities. One of the teachers in this study expressed clearly the kind of mentoring she received from the bilingual district coordinator. The teacher stated:

> Fue la que me enseñó...como trabajar en este pais: como hacer un plan de lección, hasta preparar una clase de lectura. [She was the one who taught me how to work in this country: how to do lesson plans and to prepare a reading lesson.] (p. 230)

The district coordinator was viewed as a person who helped with sociocultural as well as pedagogical concerns. Because bilingual education is a relatively recent teaching category, many bilingual teachers have had to assume positions of leadership and innovation. In their work, they generally have had little to rely on for support, other than each other or the district coordinator. It has been only since the recent advent of teacher education reform that in districts or schools with high concentrations of LEP students, staff developers have emerged, and more formal mentoring programs addressing teacher needs have been developed.

Both informal and formal bilingual education mentoring situations mentioned earlier depart from the mainstream models in a variety of ways; some reasons for this are unique to bilingual education and urban settings. A key question is, who is the mentor? This question is not simply a matter of the number of mentors who have proficiency in more than one language, but the nature of their expertise. It appears that many mentors of bilingual teachers are not adequately prepared to work with language minority students; often, they also do not speak a language other than English. Thus, the matching is inadequate; while the mentee may be bilingual, the mentor may not. There are reasons for this. First, the majority of bilingual teachers are in school buildings where there is only one bilingual teacher per grade level. In urban areas, the bilingual teacher shortage exacerbates this phenomenon. Second, many programs have used state certification as a minimal criterion for ensuring quality in the selection of mentors. While bilingual education has been in existence for twenty years, bilingual certification is a product of merely the past ten years with only 29 of the 50 states and the District of Columbia offering either an extension or self-standing certification in this area (McFerren, 1988). Furthermore, many large districts like Chicago and New York City have their own local city license requirements, often thwarting incentives for obtaining state certification. Consequently, many veteran bilingual teachers who are experienced, but who may not possess bilingual state certification, fail to qualify as mentors for novice teachers and are effectively excluded from state mentoring programs.

One of the ways some mentoring programs have moved to circumvent the license match is by using the criteria of assignment match. In effect, a certified math teacher teaching science can mentor a novice bilingual science teacher. In other words, even though content and pedagogy ought to guide the match of mentor with mentee, given the complexity of supply and demand for teachers, the minimal match is at the general pedagogical level. Finally, bilingual teachers are often viewed as specialists whose knowledge is associated with teaching only a certain segment of the student population. Their knowledge is acknowledged as needed, but not perceived as necessarily relevant to the general knowledge base about teaching (Torres-Guzmán, 1994). In examining this phenomenon, Ruiz (1993) has documented that general educational literature on school reform and effective teaching rarely incorporates pertinent knowledge from the field of bilingual education. Thus, the tex-

ture of the educational discussions in the regular/bilingual, mentor/mentee relationship is likely to include more talk about teaching generically, than about the topics of culture, bilingualism or second language learning (Macias, 1988).

In summary, this analysis of mentoring practices for bilingual teachers reveals, first, that formal mentoring programs appear to be designed with the general student and teacher population in mind and that mentoring the bilingual teacher is an afterthought. Second, in regular education mentor/bilingual mentee pairings, which is what is most commonly found, the nature of the mentoring dialogue is not targeted to the needs of the bilingual teacher. For the novice bilingual teacher, the regular education veteran teacher's knowledge may be limited and the dialogue about school change may not give sufficient attention to the bilingual learner's needs.

WHAT ARE SOME OF THE SALIENT ISSUES IN RELATION TO THE IMPLEMENTATION OF MENTORING MODELS?

The principle of certification match is key to understanding why some issues are salient in the implementation. Notwithstanding variables such as the personality and history of the individual, the underlying premise of the mentoring relationship is that if both mentor and mentee are prepared to teach the same subject, at the same level, and have knowledge of bilingual teaching, they will have a broader common content and pedagogical understanding from which to start the relationship. This is true for a high school biology mentor/mentee match and it is also true for a bilingual middle school math pair.

The importance of content congruity between mentors and mentees has been underscored by Calderon (1994) who studied twenty-five pairs of minority/bilingual teachers in mentoring relationships. She found that teacher pairs engaged in both instructional—classroom management, teaching materials, assessment—and personal talk—relationships with colleagues and financial management. She also found that the categories of instructional talk were no different from those any other teacher mentor-teacher mentee dyad might discuss. However, the kinds of questions that characterized the talk were directly related to bilingualism and the needs of LEP students. Some examples of questions discussed were: "I have LEP students, monolingual Spanish- and monolingual English-speaking students, how do I group them? I have two grade level combinations and some LEP students, what do I do? When do I conduct ESL? How is the language arts block split between first and second language instruction? (Calderon, 1994 p. 139).

If we examine the dialogue of mentors/mentees further, we can identify the following four critical areas:

how to think about language and instruction (that is, on what language policy will instructional practices be based?);

how to incorporate culture in the organization of instruction (that is, who are the students? What community/parent resources can be tapped in constructing pedagogy, and so forth);

how to think about the interaction of language and cognitive development (that is, what are the linguistic competencies of students and how do they affect students' measured performance); and

how to think about education for social justice and transformation (that is, how do

teachers contribute to the growth and development of a particular student-and the language group they work with so that students have an equal opportunity for participating in this society, now and in the future?).

These four areas represent salient issues in the field of bilingual/bicultural education with which all teachers must grapple. A brief review of these issues in relation to mentoring follows.

LANGUAGE OF INSTRUCTION

Language of instruction is a critical topic for the bilingual teacher and ought to be part of the mentor/mentee dialogue. What language do I teach in and when? How do I teach in two languages? What students do I teach in what language? For teachers to discover how to make these decisions within their own circumstances and classrooms, they need pedagogical theory and clear language policies.

Bilingual research promotes the theory that, in order for students to successfully undertake instruction in a second language, they need a strong foundation in the native language (Cummins, 1986; Hakuta and Diaz, 1985; Hakuta, 1986; Ruiz, 1993). Common wisdom in the bilingual education field indicates that establishing a strong linguistic and academic foundation in the native language while learning a second language well enough to function academically takes from 5 to 7 years. Ramirez et al., (1991) in the most comprehensive large scale government-directed study, found that students in programs organized around the principle of "the strong foundation" (termed late-exit programs) fared better academically, than those enrolled in early-exit transitional and English immersion programs. Students in late-exit programs also performed better than the national California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) norming population. In other words, bilingual education should be viewed as an educational program that takes language differences into account. The main question driving a teacher's thinking about language policy and classroom practices ought to be how well students will perform academically in the long run, not how fast students test out of the programs and are mainstreamed.

To set up instructional practices that will foster better academic outcomes, teachers need to communicate a clear native language policy to their students. For example, Vasquez (1993) and Milk (1993) document how the absence of a clear native language policy at the instructional level leads students to "subvert" their choice of language. In other words, children tend to switch to the perceived default language—English. Vasquez and Milk indicate that students take their lead from the adult (teacher) and the material used in the classroom when making choices about the language they speak during instruction. Even when the teacher is clear and his/her practices are consistent, there are many other variables to consider: subject matter and student composition, linguistic heterogeneity, and district politics. According to Lemberger (1990), the need for a consistent language "policy throughout schools and districts provides teachers a foundation [for classroom usage], so they do not feel they have to create the policy individually within their classes" (p. 315).

CULTURE AND INSTRUCTION

Culture and instruction cannot be separated. Teachers often experience an uneasiness about how to organize instruction. When this occurs, various factors influence what happens: what they have learned from their teacher education

program, their level of experience, and the adopted school curriculum. For example, if the teacher education program is based on the "view that bicultural children do not receive enough verbal and social stimulation in their homes" (Daarder, 1991), their conceptions of developing cultural components to enrich their students may be limited to exposing them to museums, theaters, and concerts of the mainstream culture. Equity may therefore be interpreted as bringing bicultural children "up to par" by providing them with activities that parallel the experiences of dominant group students. As Nieto (1992) points out, this type of assumption about what language minority children need is not based on respecting what children have to bring into the instructional situation. This is an inadequate treatment of culture and instruction because it recognizes solely the limitation, not the strengths of the youngsters and their communities.

We have significant evidence in the field of bilingual/bicultural education that culture is an important component in the organization of instruction and teacher preparation (Macias, 1988) and that the relationships of self-confidence, self-esteem, identity, and language are related to achievement (Ogbu and Matuti-Bianchi, 1986; Suarez-Orozco, 1987; Ferdman, 1990). Matuti-Bianchi's (1980) findings from more than a decade ago still ring true. In a study of bilingual programs in California, she found that the task of affirming the culture of the students did not go beyond the presence of cultural artifacts (e.g., piñatas, sarapes, food fairs, and cultural displays). Culture–specific social interactions, multicultural values, and the like were absent. These instructional strategies based on a "culture as artifact" perspective shape how teachers and students conceptualize culture (Nieto, 1992). Key to teachers developing a deeper understanding of how instruction itself can be framed in more culturally relevant ways is exposure to works such as the Hawaiian Kamehameha Program, the Arizona Project on Literacy, and others. The important principle guiding these projects is that each community, irrespective of poverty, race, or ethnicity, has funds of knowledge and resources (Rivera and Zehler, 1990) that teachers can use to create curricula and educational environments that are inclusive of students' backgrounds and provide students greater access to new knowledge.

Given that the transformation of the concept of culture is undergoing perhaps one of the most intense debates in this nation's history, it too becomes an important element in the dialogue of the mentor and the mentee. How does one undertake the task of affirming diversity in the classroom? How does a teacher become conscious of her/his ways of interacting socially that are culture specific and that guide how instruction is organized? How does a teacher examine these and how does a teacher proceed to develop more equitable and affirming practices within the classroom?

LANGUAGE AND COGNITIVE DEVELOPMENT

Teachers are often faced with having to group children for instruction and grade their performance. While most school districts have instituted systematic language assessment procedures, much of the information gathered is difficult to interpret (Baker, 1993) and becomes of little use to teachers. Other factors that must be considered when conducting or developing language assessments include first language development and its relationship to second language achievement (Hakuta and Diaz, 1985), and linguistic

165-853 O - 95 -,2

variations in the first language that are related to cultural and regional differences (Torres-Guzmán, 1990). In addition, assessment instruments written in English cannot simply be translated into other languages to serve populations who speak those languages. Such translations and adaptations require "maintaining the original version of the system while taking into consideration the integrity of an entirely new code" (Torres-Guzmán, 1990, p. 149).

As a consequence of the issues outlined above, teachers, including bilingual educators, are guilty of using inadequate assessment instruments (Carrasco, 1981) and of making incorrect assessments about bilingual students' competence. Despite an awareness that assessments "must be sensitively crafted to accommodate diverse forms of authentic communication and that they should assess only what students have had a fair opportunity to learn" (Bass, 1993, p. 32), assessment efforts in many states fail to address the needs of linguistically and culturally different students (De Avila, Navarrete, Martinez, and Kamm, 1994). Instead, teachers often misinterpret second language learning issues as problems with intelligence (Hakuta and Diaz, 1985) and fail to include the voices of bilingual teachers, students and parents in the assessment process.

TRANSFORMATION

Finally, there is the issue of transformation and power relationships. Bilingual education is increasingly becoming a program for both mainstream and language ethnic groups, but it has traditionally been conceived as a program for an entitled language minority student population that has suffered discrimination. Bilingual education holds the promise that marginalized linguistic minorities will feel empowered to participate fully as citizens in American society. Thus, the work of the bilingual educator is inherently political; he/she is implicitly charged with giving voice to students who often remain unheard. Achieving social justice and liberation tacitly undergirds the practice of bilingual education. However, for teachers to help language minority students engage in the empowerment process, they must feel empowered themselves. In a study of preservice bilingual teachers' reflections of their teacher education programs, Ada (1986) found that respondents expressed feelings of isolation, powerlessness, and uncertainty regarding their cultural identity. This was, in part, a consequence of scant attention paid by their teacher education program to their linguistic and cultural experiences. Respondents argued that teacher education programs should encourage peer-to-peer support in order to enable them to break their isolation and build their sense of self. According to Ada (1986), the firsthand experiences of bilingual teachers who are themselves members of linguistic minority groups place them in the position of being able to understand the sociopolitical realities of the students in their classrooms.

A review of the salient issues in bilingual/bicultural education raises several other questions about mentoring: How can we, given the current critical shortages of bilingual teachers, use the notion of mutual support of teachers and learn from the existing mentoring structures to help new bilingual teachers entering the field? How should we engage bilingual teachers in transforming instructional practices and school policies so that language minority students are not simply prepared for today's world, but are empowered to participate in creating the future? What do we know about the craft of teaching in

bilingual settings? What dimensions of the dialogue need to change so that bilingual teachers can help to shape schools of the future that include the bilingual student population? And finally, how should traditional mentoring models change in order to meet these needs?

WHAT ARE THE ALTERNATIVES?

While pre-college student demographics tend toward greater diversity, the teacher population is increasingly white (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1994; Goodwin, 1991). The minority undergraduate student population does not offer much hope of changing: there are proportionately fewer undergraduates of color in the pipeline than there were a decade ago. Even with aggressive recruitment and reparation strategies, the teacher of language minorities is likely to continue to be an individual who has not had experiences similar to those of his/her students. At most, one can hope that teacher education programs will begin to prepare prospective mainstream teachers to work with the linguistically diverse populations living in large urban centers. The quality of that preparation, realistically, is likely to be questionable for some time to come. Therefore, mentoring programs become especially significant in terms of the recruitment and retention of bilingual teachers.

Over the last two decades, we have witnessed many paths taken by teachers in becoming bilingual teachers. Initially, teachers who spoke another language or English-speaking teachers who completed 150 hours of study in another language could qualify to teach in bilingual classrooms. To fill shortages, native speakers were also recruited from countries where particular languages are spoken (e.g., Latin and Central America or Asia) (Fix and Zimmerman, 199?; *World Daily*, 1987). Many of these teachers were not prepared for either the adaptation process or the demands of the urban classrooms in which they were placed. Many came into these classrooms with elitist and classist attitudes about the non-English-speaking populations within the United States and thus exacerbated the cultural dissonance experienced by the students.

During the last decade, bilingual education certification programs have changed the nature of bilingual teacher preparation; however, these programs are presently being influenced by the changes in teacher education nationwide. As a result, the certification process now encompasses five or more years. As such, the number of certified teachers graduating from cohesive teacher education programs focusing on the language minority student is not large. Ironically, not all bilingual teachers currently in service are necessarily the most knowledgeable or innovative. Many went through bilingual/bicultural teacher education programs that were based on traditional philosophies. Many need to refine their understanding of what learning means for a bilingual child and how to develop effective teaching strategies. In fact, we find that some of the better prepared bilingual teachers are found among the newly graduated who have gone through more systematic, cohesive, theoretically grounded, and reflective teacher education programs. Naturally, the latter are quite new to the task of teaching.

Nonetheless, amongst both experienced bilingual teachers and new bilingual teachers, there are excellent models. However, the fact that bilingual teacher role models are not limited to

veteran teachers makes it necessary to develop additional criteria for selecting bilingual mentor teachers. Helping relationships established between the more experienced and the novice, or the formally prepared and the "experientially prepared" teacher need to be conceptualized within an interactive paradigm whereby the strengths both members of the mentoring dyad bring to the relationship are viewed as valuable. Mentoring based on this kind of interactive model allows the veteran or inservice teacher's knowledge of practice to be conceptually grounded in the beginning teacher's knowledge of new research and theoretically based models of teaching. Even if one or the other in the pair exhibits knowledge gaps about special and specific topics (e.g., second language learning, native language instruction, and so on), the model ensures that both teachers are in the position to simultaneously learn and instruct.

WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL EDUCATION REFORM MOVEMENT?

Putting aside, for a moment, the idea of a new interactive mentoring model for urban bilingual teachers, an issue of even larger significance still remains to be confronted—the role of the teacher of the future. *Goals 2000*, for example, articulates standards of achievement and performance for the nation's students, including readiness for school, high graduation rates, subject matter competency, science and math achievement, universal literacy, and schools as safe learning environments. The language of these goals refers to student readiness and outcomes, but says little about how schools and teachers should be ready for the students. Absent also are equity considerations that take into account the unique needs and experiences of language minority children (Torres-Guzmán, 1994). Yet, the issues of diversity in language and culture are ever present in the affective as well as in the cognitive aspects of teaching. Both aspects underscore the underlying role of the teacher as communicator (with a focus on message as well as form) and facilitator (from the perspective of creating a road map for students to journey into the new century). Thus, any program for veteran and novice teachers must deliberate issues of equity for language minorities as they prepare to move all students toward the future.

The issue of mentoring for bilingual teachers takes on additional meaning if equity is to be in our future. As advocates for language minority students, bilingual teachers can be instrumental in ensuring that this fast growing population not only contributes to society but exerts an impact on how society defines itself now and in the future. Therefore, the recommended interactive model is a way to structure mentoring for bilingual teachers so that novices and veterans can engage in mutually supportive relationships. They must be able to simultaneously give and receive the support they need to sustain their commitment and revitalize their practice. However, we also suggest that the interactive model be expanded to include non-bilingual teachers. This would allow bilingual teachers to serve as mentors to colleagues who may not be prepared to be, but undoubtedly will be, responsible for students who speak languages other than English. In this way, the wisdom and experiences of bilingual teachers as well as their distinctive perspectives about the needs of bilingual/bicultural students can enrich the practices of all teachers. By building bridges between teachers so that they see themselves as responsible for all students, we can achieve national standards that every student can meet.

REFERENCES

Ada, A. F. (1986). "Creative education for bilingual education teachers." *Harvard Educational Review*, 56, 386-394.

American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (1994). *Teacher education pipeline III: Schools, colleges, and departments of education enrollments by race and ethnicity.* Washington, DC: Author.

Anderson, M. E., and Shannon, A. L. (1988). "Toward a conceptualization of mentoring." *Journal of Teacher Education*, 39, 38-42.

Baker, C. (1993). *Foundations of bilingual education and bilingualism.* Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

Bass, H. (1993). "Commentary: Let's measure what's worth measuring." *Education Week*, 13(8), 27-32.

Calderon, M. (1994). Mentoring, peer coaching, and support systems for first year minority/bilingual teachers. In R. A. DeVillar, C. J. Faltis, and J. P. Cummins (Eds)., *Cultural diversity in schools: From rhetoric to practice*, pp. 117-141. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Calderon, M., and Marsh, D. (1988). "Applying research on effective bilingual instruction in a multi-district inservice teacher training program." *National Association of Bilingual Education Journal*, 12 (2), 133-152.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century.* Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Corporation.

Carrasco, R. L. (1981). Expanded awareness of student performance: A case study in applied ethnographic monitoring of a bilingual classroom. In H. T. Trueba, G. P. Guthrie, and K. H. Au (Eds.), *Culture and the bilingual classroom: Studies in classroom ethnography.* Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Council of the Great City Schools. (1992). *National urban education goals: Baseline indicators, 1990-91.* Washington, DC: Author.

Cummins, J. (1981). "Empirical and theoretical underpinnings of bilingual education. *Journal of Education*, 163: 16-29.

Cummins, J., and Swain, M. (1986). *Bilingualism in education.* New York: Longman.

Daarder, A. (1991). *Culture and power in the classroom: A critical foundation for bicultural education.* New York: Bergin and Garvey.

Daloz, L. A. (1983). "Mentors: Teachers who make a difference." *Change*, 16(6), 24-27.

Darling-Hammond, L., and Goodwin, A. L. (1993). Progress toward professionalism in teaching. In G. Cawelti (Ed.), *Challenges and achievements of American education: The 1993 ASCD yearbook*, pp. 19-52. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

DeAvila, E., Navarrete, C., Martinez, P., and Kamm, M. (1994). "Recommendations for educational assessment concerning language-minority students." Presentation at the 23rd Annual International/Bilingual Multicultural Education Conference, 16-19 February, Los Angeles, CA.

Fagan, M. M., and Walter, G. (1982). "Mentoring among teachers." *Journal of Educational Research*, 76(2), 113-117.

Ferdman, B. M. (1990). "Literacy and cultural identity." *Harvard Educational Review*, 60, 181-216.

Fix, M., and Zimmerman, W. (1993). *Educating immigrant children.* Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Galvez-Hjornevik, C. (1986). "Mentoring among teachers: A review of the literature." *Journal of Teacher Education,* 37 (1), 6-11.

Goodwin, A. L. (1991). "Problems, process, and promise: Reflections on a collaborative approach to the minority teacher shortage." *Journal of Teacher Education,* 42(1), 28-36.

Gray, W. A., and Gray, M. M. (1985). "Synthesis of research on mentoring beginning teachers." *Educational Leadership,* 43(3),37-43.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism.* New York: Basic Books.

Hakuta, K., and Diaz, R. (1985). The relationship between degree of bilingualism and cognitive ability: A critical discussion of some new longitudinal data. In K. E. Nelson (Ed.), *Children's Language, Vol.* 5, pp. 319-344. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Huling-Austin, L. (1990). Squishy business. In T. M. Bey and C. T. Holmes (Eds.), *Mentoring: Developing successful new teachers,* pp. 39-50. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Hunt, D. M., and Michael, C. (1983). "Mentorship: A career training and development tool." *Academy of Management Review,* 8(3), 475-485.

Klopf, G., and Harrison, J. (1981, September). "Moving up the career ladder: A case for r. entors." *Principal,* 41-43.

Lemberger, N. (1990). Bilingual education: Teachers' voices. Unpublished dissertation. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Levinson, D. J., Darrow, C. M., Klein, E. G., Levinson, M. H., and McKee, B. (1978). *The seasons of a man's life.* New York: A. A. Knopf.

Macias, R. (1988). *Bilingual teacher supply and demand in the United States.* Claremont, CA: University of Southern California and the Tomas Rivera Center.

Matuti-Bianchi, M. E. (1980). "What is bicultural about bilingual/bicultural education?" *Urban Review,* 12, 91-108.

McFerren, M. (1988). *Certification of language educators in the United States.* Los Angeles, CA: UCLA, Center for Language Education and Research.

Merriam, S. (1983). "Mentors and proteges: A critical review of the literature." *Adult Education Quarterly,* 33, 161-173.

Milk, R. D. (1993). Bilingual education and English as a second language: The elementary school. In M. B. Arias and U. Casanova (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Politics, practice and research,* pp. 88-112. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Moll, L. C., and Diaz, R. (1987). Teaching writing as communication: The use of ethnographic findings in classroom practice. In D. Bloome (Ed.), *Literacy and schooling,* pp. 55-65. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Nieto, S. (1992). *Affirming diversity.* White Plains, NY: Longman.

Odell, S. J. (1990). *Mentor teacher programs.* Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Ogbu, J. U., and Matuti-Bianchi, M. E. (1986). Understanding sociocultural factors: Knowledge, identity, and school adjustment. In California State Department of Education, Bilingual Education Office (Ed.), *Beyond language: Social and cultural*

factors in schooling language minority students, pp. 73-142. Los Angeles, CA: California State University, Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center.

Phillips-Jones, L. (1982). *Mentors and proteges*. New York: Arbor House.

Ramirez, D. J., Yuen, S. D., Ramey, D. R., and Pasta, D. J. (1991). *Longitudinal study of structured English immersion strategy, early-exit, and late-exit transitional bilingual education programs for language minority children. Final report*. San Mateo, CA: Aguirre International.

Rivera, C., and Zehler, A. (1990). *Collaboration in teaching and learning: Findings from the Innovative Approaches Research Project*. Arlington, VA: Development Associates, Inc.

Ruiz, R. (1993). Critical research issues in bilingual secondary education. In Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs (Ed.), *Proceedings of the third national research symposium on limited English proficient student issues: Focus on middle and high school issues*, pp. 691-706. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Suarez-Orozco, M. (1987). Toward a psychosocial understanding of Hispanic adaptation to American schooling. In H. T. Trueba (Ed.), *Success or failure: Learning of the language minority student*, pp. 156-168. Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (1990). "Voy a Leer Escribiendo in the context of bilingual/bicultural education." *Computers in Schools*, 7(1-2), 145-171.

Torres-Guzmán, M. E. (1994). "Language minorities: Moving from the periphery to the center?" *The Educational Forum*, 58(4), 409-420.

Vasquez, O. A. (1993). A look at language as a resource: Lessons from La Clase Mágica. In M. B. Arias and U. Casanova (Eds.), *Bilingual education: Politics, practice and research*, the Ninety-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pp. 199-224. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Vogt, L., Jordan, C., and Tharp, R. (1987). "Explaining school failure, producing school success: Two cases." *Anthropology and Education Quarterly*, 18(4), 276-286.

World Daily. "Recruit bilingual teachers." (1987, March 12). *World Daily*, P. 36.

Zey, M. C. (1984). *The mentor connection*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irving.

Zimpher, N. L., and Rieger, S. R. (1988). "Mentoring teachers: What are the issues?" *Theory into Practice*, 27 (3), 175-182.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1995 O - 165-853

OTHER TITLES AVAILABLE FROM NCBE

NCBE Focus Occasional Papers and Program Information Guides cost $3.50 per copy. To order any of the titles listed, circle their number(s), provide the information requested, and detach and mail this page, along with your check or purchase order made out to **George Washington University/NCBE,** to: NCBE Orders, 1118 22nd Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037. Alternatively, visit our gopher site to download full-text versions of these and other publications: **gopher.ncbe.gwu.edu**

FOCUS OCCASIONAL PAPERS

11. ***Implementing bilingual programs is everybody's business.*** T. Griego-Jones, 1995.
10. ***For all students: Limited English proficient students and Goals 2000.*** D. August with K. Hakuta & D. Pompa, 1994.
9. ***Bilingual education: A look to the year 2000.*** G. N. Garcia, 1994.
8. ***Distance learning: The challenge for a multicultural society***. A. Barrera, 1993.
7. ***School readiness and language minority students: Implications of the first National Education Goal***. C. D. Prince & L. A. Lawrence, 1993.
6. ***Re-thinking the education of teachers of language minority children: Developing reflective teachers for changing schools***. R. Milk et al., 1992.
5. ***Programs for secondary LEP students: A California study***. C. Minicucci & L. Olsen, 1992.
4. ***Teaching and testing achievement: The role of language development.*** M. Saville-Troike, 1991.
3. ***Bilingual education: A focus on current research.*** S. D. Krashen, 1991.

PROGRAM INFORMATION GUIDES

24. ***TeamWorks. Mainstream and bilingual/ESL teacher collaboration.*** K. Sakash & F. V. Rodriguez-Brown, 1995.
23. ***Linguistic diversity and reform: Can the practices be identified?*** A. Nadeau, 1995.
22. ***Assessing language development in bilingual preschool children.*** B. McLaughlin, A. Gesi Blanchard & Y. Osanai, 1995.
21. ***Integrating Title I and Title VII: The evolving model of Dearborn Public Schools, Michigan.*** S. Arraf, M. Fayz, M. Sedgeman & R. Karam Haugen, 1995.
20. ***Reconstructing the bilingual special education interface.*** L. Baca & J. S. de Valenzuela, 1994.
19. ***Working with English language learners: Strategies for elementary and middle school teachers.*** A. M. Zehler, 1994.
18. ***Whole-school bilingual education programs: Approaches for sound assessment.*** A. Del Vecchio et al., 1994.
17. ***Family literacy for language minority families: Issues for program implementation.*** M. Mulhern, F. Rodriguez-Brown & T. Shanahan, 1994.
16. ***Multicultural education: Strategies for linguistically diverse schools and classrooms***. D. Menkart, 1993.
15. ***Reforming mathematics instruction for ESL literacy students***. K. Buchanan & M. Helman, 1993.
14. ***Applying elements of effective secondary schooling for language minority students***. T. Lucas, 1993.
13. ***The Literacy Club: A cross-age tutoring/paired reading project.*** B. Cook & C. Urzua, 1993.
12. ***Cooperative learning in the secondary school: Maximizing language acquisition, academic achievement, and social development***. D. Holt, B. Chips & D. Wallace, 1992.
11. ***Teaching science to English learners, grades 4–8***. A. Fathman, M. Quinn & C. Kessler, 1992.
10. ***Writer's workshop and children acquiring English as a non-native language***. K. Davies Samway, 1992.
9. ***Performance and portfolio assessment for language minority students***. L. Valdez Pierce & J. M. O'Malley, 1992.
8. ***The Newcomer Program: Helping immigrant students succeed in U.S. schools***. M. Friedlander, 1991.
7. ***Integrating language and content instruction: Strategies and techniques***. D. J. Short, 1991.
6. ***Fostering home-school cooperation: Involving language minority families as partners in education***. E. Violand-Sánchez, C. P. Sutton & H. W. Ware, 1991.

detach here

ORDER INFORMATION

Name: _____

Address: _____

_____

Phone: _____

_____ **ORDER TOTAL**

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

María E. Torres-Guzmán is an associate professor and Director of the Program in Bilingual/Bicultural Education at Teachers College, Columbia University. She has published numerous articles and chapters, coauthored *Learning in two worlds*, and, since 1984, worked with teachers reflecting on their classroom practices.

Lin A. Goodwin is an assistant professor and Co-director of the Preservice Program in Childhood Education in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her research and writing focus on multicultural teacher education, educational equity, transformative teaching, teacher beliefs, and the education experiences of Asian Americans. Recent publications include "Teaching and teacher education" in the first *Asian American Almanac*.

FOCUS

Mentoring Bilingual Teachers

Mentoring novice teachers is an important strategy for training bilingual/bicultural education teachers because it has proven useful in curtailing the number of teachers who leave the teaching profession during the induction period of their careers. The support a beginning teacher gets from an experienced teacher helps her/him feel confident and competent. Teachers prepared to work with the language minority population, who feel confident and competent to do so, are the most scarce among all teacher groups.

Mentoring Bilingual Teachers, by M. E. Torres-Guzmán and L. A. Goodwin, provides a definition of mentoring, reviews the literature on mentoring and bilingual/bicultural education, and identifies salient issues regarding mentoring implementation and alternatives. Last, there is a discussion of the importance of preparing teachers who will (a) help language minority students become partners in shaping the future, and (b) create partnerships with non-bilingual teachers to support this process.

NCBE

National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education
1118 22nd Street NW Washington DC 20037